

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for considering the pending application. The Office Action dated September 21, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 3, and 12 have been amended and claims 22-24 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Currently, claims 1-4, 12-16, and 22-24 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,629) in view of Kwak (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878), Gu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,672) and Watanabe et al. (US 2003/0086041). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a compensation film formed in a pixel region to contact the passivation film, the compensation film compensates for phase variations of light; and a pixel electrode formed on at least the compensation film, wherein the pixel electrode overlaps the data line and the compensation film is only located under the pixel electrode.”

To render a claimed invention obvious, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim 1. Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Watanabe et al. fail to teach or even suggest these elements. And the combined teachings of Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al. and Watanabe et al. still fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the claim 1 and thus cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al. and Watanabe et al. And claims 2 and 22 depend on claim 1 and thus are allowable over Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et

al. and Watanabe et al. at least for the same reason as claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

As amended, claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, “forming a compensation film in a pixel region to contact at least the passivation film, the compensation film compensates for phase variations of light; and forming a pixel electrode on the compensation film, wherein the pixel electrode overlaps the data line and the compensation film is only located under the pixel electrode”.

To render a claimed invention obvious, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim 3. Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Watanabe et al. fail to teach or even suggest these elements. And the combined teachings of Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Watanabe et al. still fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the claim 3 and thus cannot render claim 3 obvious.

Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Watanabe et al. And claims 4 and 23 depend on claim 3 and thus are allowable over Hatano et al., Kwak, Gu et al., and Watanabe et al. at least for the same reason as claim 3. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,629) in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,582,862). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As amended, claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, “a compensation film at least disposed between the pixel electrode and the thin film transistor substrate to contact the pixel electrode within a pixel region, wherein the compensation film compensates for phase variations of light transmitted through the liquid crystal material and is only located under the pixel electrode.”

To render a claimed invention obvious, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim 12. Hatano et al. and Nakamura et al. fail to teach or even suggest these elements.. And the combined teachings of Hatano et al. and Nakamura et al. still fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the claim 12 and thus cannot render claim 12 obvious.

Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable over Hatano et al. and Nakamura et al. And claims 13-16 and 24 depend on claim 12 and thus are allowable over Hatano et al. and Nakamura et al. at least for the same reason as claim 12. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.

50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP

Dated: October 24, 2007

By: 

Robert J. Goodell, Reg. No. 41,040

Customer No. 009629
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001